

518. C9
4
10. M. d.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

ON

EXECUTORY DEVICES,

OR

ON THE POWER OF INDIVIDUALS

TO PRESCRIBE, BY TESTAMENTARY DISPOSITIONS,

THE PARTICULAR FUTURE USES TO BE MADE OF
THEIR PROPERTY.

*Occasioned by the last Will of the late Mr. PETER THELLUSSON,
of London.*

BY

JOHN LEWIS DE LOLME, LL. D.

AUTHOR OF THE BOOK ON THE "CONSTITUTION OF ENGLAND."

THE SECOND EDITION.

LONDON:

Printed by W. and C. Spilsbury, No. 57, Snowhill, London.

PUBLISHED BY J. RICHARDSON AND SON, UNDER THE ROYAL-EXCHANGE; C. LAW, AVE-MARIA-
LANE; T. EGERTON, WHITEHALL; AND W. CLARKE, NEW BOND-STREET.

1800.

REFERENCES in the following Pages.

At the end of the second Paragraph, add, *See back, page 10.*

In page 24, last line but two, instead of *page 19*, read *19 and 10.*

In page 34, last line, instead of *pages 18, 19* read *18, 10.*

In page 35, seventh line, instead of *pages 18, 19*, read *18, 10.*

Executors who engage to carry on such *Trusts* do, in fact, resolutely engage to enter upon, and to go through, such courses of proceeding.

They are bold Men: they certainly are no Cowards. The christian name of one of the three *Executors* named in the *Will* of the late Mr. Peter Thelluffon, is *Emperor*—(*Emperor* John Woodford). Most likely the consideration of their having an *Emperor* among them, has given them hope of being able to carry on their *Trust*.

Their courage is evident. They are to deal in landed Property, Manors, Freeholds, and most widely-extended purchases: it is all to be open business.

POSTSCRIPT.

A DESCRIPTION has been given, in the preceding pages, of the state of hostility and breach of the peace against Mankind in which the Executor of an *Executory Devise* continues moving. He is in such a state of breach of the peace by his assumption of authority over Mankind, and by being, in fact, invested with a power of resolutely repulsing and dismissing the claims, complaints and objections of all such Individuals as he happens to have dealings with, relatively to the *devised* Property. These resolute dismissals of the claims, complaints and objections of Individuals, an *Executor* performs by means of resolute allegations of the superior duty he owes to the *devised* Property, and to his Employer the *Testator*, whose approbation he never can possibly obtain for the discharging of any claim, or attending to any complaint or objection.

Abundant instances of such *resolute dismissals* have been given in the preceding pages; and the observation has also been made, that the *Executor's* alledged superior duty to his *Testator*, and his reso-

lute *dismissing power* arising from such alledged superior duty, are moreover strengthened and *affirmed* in Courts of Law by means of their affirmation or adoption of the devising *Will*.

In those preceding pages I went no farther than describing the above-mentioned state of hostility and course of breach of the peace against Mankind. I forbore pointing out and fully ascertaining the high and truly serious degree of illegality with which the practice of *Executory Devises* is farther connected; because I was afraid of bringing into a danger of immediate *forfeiture*, not only the Property of the late Mr. Thelluffon, but also that whole mass of *devised* Property which lies in the Court of Chancery, tied down to certain fixed *Uses*, by the continued *Wills* and commands of *Masters* who never can be consulted with; and tied down, too, in some cases, for half, and even whole centuries.

But the danger of *forfeiture* in regard to the above-mentioned Properties is now over. Since the first publication of the preceding part of this Pamphlet, a Committee of Judges have made the same mistake as had been made by other Judges before them. That Committee have not only paused nearly five months on the matter, thereby shewing they were perplexed, but have even at last *affirmed* the late Mr. Thelluffon's *Will*; by which they have made it manifest that they continued to mistake, or miss seeing, the truly serious illegality which is connected with the practice of *Executory Devises*. Since Judges, acting with the most perfect freedom from any malevolent intentions against the Laws of the Country, have mistaken the real state of the case, it follows that common Testators must be allowed to have merely fallen into *mistakes*, and to have been free from guilt, when devising and strictly tying down their Properties to *unmodifiable Uses*, to be executed by *Executors* whom no Courts of Law or any living Persons could remove: the consequence of which observation is, that the Properties devised by those Testators in the manner here described, have become saved from *forfeiture*. By their *affirmation* of the late Mr. Thelluffon's *Will*, the Committee of Judges have, in fact, covered all the above-mentioned Properties with the mantle of their own guiltless, unspotted intentions.

I am

I am now proceeding to shew the high degree of illegality which really attends the practice of *Executory Devises*. This high illegality directly appears from the very allegations which are made with an intent to excuse that practice. The Gentlemen of the Law excuse an *Executor* engaged in the practice here mentioned, no better than by positively making professions of this *Executor* moreover committing other acts of most serious guilt, which professions are no doubt unthinkingly made, and without any bad intention.

For instance, they excuse an *Executor* in regard to the engagement he has taken to disobey all such Acts of Parliament as happen to be passed contrary to his Trust, (*see back, from page 4 to 10*) by alledging that the *Executor*, in such case, *forbears* to execute his Trust. Very well; but what does the *Executor* do with the *devised* Property, after he finds he *cannot* execute the Trust? does he return or deliver back the Land, when he finds he cannot cut the Timber? * does he return the Property of any kind to the *Proprietor*? No; he keeps it. Therefore he keeps it as stolen Property, or embezzled Property.

If, after the Master of a Ship has taken in corn for exportation to France or America, an Act prohibiting such exportation happens to be passed, this Master of the Ship is not to keep the corn, sending it to his own warehouses on shore, by way of solacing himself under the grief he feels on account of the passing of the Act: he must apply to the Owner of the corn, and tell him, "Sir, take your corn back, and discharge your duty yourself to the Act of Parliament." If a Porter is sent to carry a deposit of money to a Banker's counting-house, and he finds the counting-house shut, either because the Clerks have thought proper to go home, or the Bankers have given up business, the Porter is not to march off with the

* This is an allusion to what is observed in page 9, relatively to the prescription which is laid by Mr. Thelluffon's *Will* upon the *Executor* to cut the Timber upon the *devised* Land. Now, an Act of Parliament for prohibiting or very much restricting the cutting of Timber may be soon expected to take place; because that Commission which was appointed a few years ago for inquiring into the state of Timber over the whole Country, have concluded their Report with an earnest recommendation that extensive restrictions may be laid on the cutting of Timber.

the money as his perquisite: he must carry this money back to the Person who sent him with it; telling him, "Sir, take your money back; I cannot deliver it; try, if you choose, to deliver it yourself." If a Man sends a Groom to take a Horse to certain livery-stables which he names to him, and the Groom finds the stables shut, he is not to ride away with the Horse: he must seek the Owner, and restore the Horse to him. To attempt therefore to excuse an Executor, by alledging that he complies with Acts of Parliament by disobeying the *Trust*, but that he nevertheless continues after that to keep the trusted or *devised* Property, is excusing him by professing that this Executor puts himself in a very serious state of guilt, in a situation of real theft and embezzlement.

I may, besides, observe that an *Executor*, in such a case, violates his Oath; since he has moreover taken an Oath to observe the *Trust*: however I shall not go farther into that subject, because the violation of an Oath relates to divine more than to human Laws. Continuing therefore to speak only of human Laws, I shall farther mention that an Executor, by the mere taking of an Oath to the Testator his Employer, does in fact offend against the Statutes of *Præmunire*. Those Statutes prohibit the taking of Oaths to any Being whatever, other than the governing Power of the Country. The mere *tendering* of such Oaths, or requesting that such Oaths may be taken, is highly illegal. There is therefore a serious degree of illegality in an Executor *actually* taking an Oath to his Testator or private Employer; from whose Property, it must be farther observed, he cannot be removed.

The Gentlemen of the Law also attempt to excuse an Executor in regard to that power which he assumes, of resolutely dismissing the claims of Individuals; which he does, as before mentioned, by alledging his superior duty to an Employer whose approbation he never can obtain for the discharge of any claim: a duty which he has moreover caused to be strengthened and *affirmed* by Courts of Law. These Gentlemen say, if an Executor exerts his *dismissing* power with too much obstinacy, he may be sued before a Court of Law, and
be

be compelled by Judgments to discharge claims. Very well; but he is so compelled by a violation of *Magna Charta*. For, how is he sued? he is sued in his own, the Executor's name. And how is Judgment given against him? also in his own name. And with what Property is he made to pay? is he made to pay with his own Property, the Property of him, the Executor, against whom Judgment has been given? No; he is made to pay out of the *devised* Property, out of the Property of his Testator, against whom no Judgment has been given. Now, this kind of Law-proceeding, by which the Property of a Proprietor is come upon against whom *no Judgment* has been given, is contrary to the 29th Article of *Magna Charta*, in which the King declared in behalf of the Subject, "Neither shall we go upon him, nor shall we send upon him, unless it be by the Judgment of his Peers, or by Acts or Statutes of Parliament."

I shall add a fact which the Reader will think somewhat remarkable. When an Executor happens to desert his *Trust*, either because he is become careless, or perhaps does not find from it the advantage he had expected for himself, the Courts of Law punish him by allowing all demands and suits to continue to go against him in the same manner as before, though he has cast off the Testator's Property; and they then make him really pay out of his own Property; that is his punishment: so that he is punished by being *compelled* to observe *Magna Charta*. Not so when he continues to follow his *Trust* to the satisfaction of the Courts: he is then rewarded; and his reward is by being indulged with a *permission* to violate *Magna Charta*.

The Gentlemen of the Law also *excuse* the Executor of the *unmodifiable* prescriptions of his Testator, by alledging that this Executor, if he be a little tender-hearted, or if cautious forbearance becomes requisite, may not perhaps quite invariably exert his power of resolutely dismissing the claims proffered by Individuals: he may sometimes discharge such claims of his own accord, and without waiting till, by judgment being given against *himself*, he is compelled, in the King's name, to pay out of the Property of his Testator, against whom no judgment has been given, and thus to violate *Magna Charta*. Very true; but then the Executor, when thus *willingly* paying,

paying, pays with serious guilt of another kind; he pays by a real embezzlement; since he pays without the possible knowledge and approbation of his Employer. What honest Man, what Man of honour would accept a payment from a Servant or Clerk who should say, "Sir, I will pay you out of my Master's Property, though he shall never have knowledge of such payment?"

In short, it turns out, that the Gentlemen of the Law *excuse* an Executor by professing that, to such Claimants or *Demandants* as prove rather too sturdy for him, the Executor says, "Sir, I will pay you, if, by suing me in that manner in which an Executor is to be proceeded against, you choose to violate *Magna Charta* along with me: let us violate *Magna Charta* together; and you shall have your money or claim." To other Claimants the Executor says, "Sir, I will pay you of my own accord; but I must embezzle the money first; and yourself do join with me; do consent and accede to the embezzlement by accepting the payment of the money, though I am telling you that the Testator, my Master, shall never, at any time, have knowledge of such payment."

Many honest Claimants rather choose to lose their dues than accede to such doings; and their losses constitute a part of an Executor's profits. One honest Claimant of that sort I may name, who is a very important one, both in regard to *respectability*, and to the nature of the claims; and that is Government itself. Taxes are constantly forborne being levied, when the Property out of which the Tax is to be paid, appears directly, and on the very first inspection of the Case, to be *devised* or *trusted* Property. Government will not consent to a Tax being levied on the Property of a Proprietor who has not had, nor can possibly have had, *any notice* of the Tax. When the Chancellor of the Exchequer laid his Proposal of the *Assessed* Taxes before Parliament, he expressed a deal of honest anxiety on the subject of devised Property; and at last he concluded on the honest side of the question, by allowing such devised Property to enjoy an exemption. And I have been told that the present Tax upon *Income* is likewise forborne being levied upon *devised* Property.

Nor does Government lose its dues merely in regard to that friendly assistance and those retributions it has a right to expect, on account of the protection it is continually affording to *devised* Property (sometimes amounting to prodigious stocks or masses), as well

as to every other kind of Property; but Government also loses its claims in cases of *Forfeitures*. The Gentlemen of the Law have positively obtained to have the point established, that no act of an Executor can produce the forfeiture of the *devised* Property. An Executor may use the ships and stores of his *Testator*, for the purpose of sending supplies to an Enemy; and they cannot be touched: they are the Property of a Master against whom no Judgment can be given. (Those Ships cannot be touched otherwise than in the manner of a common seizure made at Sea, by being caught in the very act, and in the very time.)

An Executor may allow the use of the lands and fields of his *Testator* for the purpose of treasonable meetings, and even rebellious encampments; and Government cannot seize upon those fields: no Judgment can be given against the *Testator*, who is the Master. An Executor may use the Horses and Chaises of his *Testator* for the purpose of carrying on a treasonable correspondence across the Country; and they are not liable to any forfeiture. The *Testator* is the Master of them: he is a Master against whom no Judgment can be given: he *can do no wrong*; his Property *can do no wrong*: he stops the hand of Government itself.

Since Government has thus given way, it is easy to understand how an *Executor* may succeed in engrossing masses of Property at the expence of private, scattered Individuals, easily overawed by this Executor's power of resolutely dismissing claims, complaints and objections of any kind, by means of a bold allegation of the superior duty he owes to the *Testator*, his Employer, whose approbation he cannot possibly obtain for the discharging of any claim, or attending to any objection; which alledged duty has been strengthened and affirmed by Courts of Law.

A very important observation must be introduced in this place, which is, that the mere circumstance of a *Testator*, against whom *no Judgment can be given*, being allowed to continue to be a *Proprietor*, is, of itself and without any farther consideration, a most serious illegality; it is an infringement on the Statutes of *Præmunire*. And any Man who pretends to be an Executor or Servant to such a *Proprietor*, joins in such an infringement, and takes upon himself the guilt of the *posthumous* continuation of the same.

It

It may perhaps be said, that the Case of the Administration of a Minor's Property is similar to the Case of an *Executorship*: is not an *Executor* like a *Guardian*? No such thing: an *Executor* is not like a *Guardian*. A *Guardian* has always his *Minor* and legal *Proprietor* along with him, by whose presence he constantly gives legality to his proceedings; and that is the reason for which the *Guardian* to the Property is always *Guardian* to the Person. Suits at Law are not carried on in the *Guardian's* name: all Suits, either *pro* or *con*, are in the *Minor's* name; who is even frequently made to appear, and whom it is always in the power of the *Guardian* to produce. Likewise, when a *Guardian* willingly pays or discharges claims, he does so in a manner in the company of his *Minor*, to whom he is a Guide and Assistant.

In short, a *Guardian* and his *Minor*, together, form a *legal Man*, a *legal Proprietor*, who is free from offence against the Statutes of *Præmunire*; who may be legally sued and compelled to pay without any violation of *Magna Charta*; and by whom claims may also be willingly discharged with legality, without embezzlement, and without trepanning any Individual who receives a payment into an accession to such embezzlement, that is, into a consent to receive such payment notwithstanding it be admitted that the *Proprietor*, out of whose Property the payment is made, is never, at any time, to have knowledge of the same; as is always expressly admitted when an *Executor* pays.

To which add, that a *Guardian* is positively liable to being removed; even upon his *Minor's* Petition; but an *Executor* cannot be removed;—he cannot be removed from the management of the Property of the Testator, his Master, without the consent of that Master.

It is not to be denied, however, that Administrations of *Minor's* Properties by *Guardians* are frequently taken advantage of, for carrying on engrossing schemes at the expence of other classes of Individuals. But the abuses can never reach such lengths as those do which arise from *Executorships*: and, in fact, when an engrossing scheme is particularly aimed at, under cover of a *Minority*, the expedient of additionally employing an *Executor* is always resorted to by a Testator. The time of the duration of an *Executorship* may, besides,

besides, be made to be incomparably longer than the time of the duration of a Minority. (See back, pages 2, and 20, 21.)

The Practice of *Executory Devises* is moreover highly contrary to the intent of the Statutes of Mortmain: I mean those Statutes by which Property, especially in land, is restricted in a considerable degree from being devised by last *Wills*, or otherwise transferred, to *Corporate Bodies*. It seems to me that Lawyers, either in this or other Countries, have not pointed out the truest reasons for which Statutes of this sort have been passed or decreed by all Governments. One of the true reasons seems to be, the power which such *Corporate Bodies* derive from their weight, and the number of their Associates, for the purpose of setting at defiance or turning aside the claims, complaints and objections of other Individuals; thereby assuming an advantage against the rest of Mankind which is not enjoyed against them. And the means by which these *Corporate Bodies* assume such overruling power over the claims, complaints and objections of other Individuals, is, in fact, by *hiding* themselves, that is to say, by making it difficult for other Individuals to find out and ascertain a real *Proprietor* among the Associates who compose such Corporate Bodies. Every one of these Associates refers to the other Associates, and says, "You must catch the time when the Corporation is sitting: they may then attend to your allegation, and then perhaps deliberate upon it, and perhaps also come to some determination about it, by taking and ascertaining a *Majority* among themselves." And even then the business is not settled; for it may become difficult for individual Strangers to prove and clearly point out such *Majority* to other Men. The case is not by any means so in regard to *Partnerships* among Merchants. A Partner in a Trading House is not to say, "We are five Partners; you must catch us all five together (if you can); and then we may perhaps pay you." If *Partnerships* had been instituted on such a Plan, they would have been found to be unbearable; but they are not so: every Partner binds the whole Partnership by his *single* signature; and he also *singly* and legally pays for the whole Partnership. Every Partner in Trade is made to be an *whole Proprietor*, not allowed to *hide himself* by any put-off and reference to other Partners.

It must however be confessed, that, when a real visible *Proprietor*, or a real visible *Proprietorship*, has been once ascertained

in a Corporate Body relatively to any affair by individual Strangers, that affair is thenceforwards managed and terminated with legality, that is to say, without trepanning such Strangers into violations of *Magna Charta*, or into accessions to embezzlements, previously to allowing such Strangers their dues. But, in the case of an *Executory Devise*, the Proprietor or Testator is not merely *bidden* for some shorter or longer time: it is admitted that he never can possibly be found and produced. To which add, that, when those *illegal* advantages which are expressly and purposely designed to be taken of Mankind by the bold allegation of such *perpetual absence*, appear too intolerable, and cautious forbearance becomes absolutely requisite, the expedient is used, of flinching and skulking from such advantages, as above observed, by committing offences against *Magna Charta*, as well as against the laws directly relative to embezzlements; and, by professions of such skulking offences being committed, the practice of Executory Devises continues to be *excused*. From which it follows that this practice is, all together, a worse case, by far, than any of those which are expressly named in the Statutes of *Mortmain*.

It is enacted by the Statute of the 13th year of Queen ELIZABETH, that, if a Merchant hides himself for a very few days only, even in his own House, and even also though his Clerks and Servants may continue saying, they expect him every hour, such Merchant is ousted from his Property; which is immediately taken possession of for such Persons as may prove their claims. How therefore can it be pretended that any Being, with the name of being a *Testator*, or with any name, can continue to be a *Proprietor* during a period of perhaps an hundred years, or more, though it is admitted that he cannot be consulted with, in any shape, by his Executors or Servants, or any Person, during the whole time; and that, even after the expiration of that time, he is not to make any appearance?*

Those

* The Reader may perhaps wish to know what period of time is allowed for the *duration* of an *Executorship*. The rule is this: A Testator may cause his property to continue to be *unmodifiably* managed by his Executor and Servant, that is to say, may cause the power over the property to continue in himself, the Testator, during the lives of any such number of Persons in being at the time of his decease, as he chooses to name. The Testator, it is said, may take up the *Red Book* or Court Calendar, and prescribe that the *Executorship* is to last during the lives of all the Persons named in the book, as well as of any other Persons or Children, either just born, or in the womb, whom he may choose to name besides. And if
at

Those Lawyers who undertake to write in a proper form such last *Wills* as are intended to contain Executory Devises, always take care to introduce a clause by which the Testator *ratifies beforehand* all such Deeds prescribed to be performed by the Executors, as require formally-authenticated ratifications from Proprietors, for their being valid. I mention this by way of shewing how truly Lawyers consider a *Testator* as continuing to be the *Proprietor* during the whole time the Executorship is to last, and to be the Master and Employer of the Executor; who, in fact, cannot be removed otherwise than with this Master's consent. To which must be added, that this Testator is thus made to give his ratification and approbation to things and deeds, of the true performances of which he never can have any *knowledge*. If, in the performing of those deeds afterwards, any fraud happens to be committed by the Executor against the Testator's Property, or against other Persons, or by other Persons against him, the Testator nevertheless ratifies it all.

A Gentleman of the Law who has lately written on the subject of *Executory Devises*, calls such engrossing schemes as have a tendency, by means of such *Devises*, to engross scores of millions, and whole Counties, by no worse a name than schemes of *posthumous avarice*. But some farther definitions might be given of such engrossing *Executory Devises*; no matter whether they are intended for effecting prodigious engrossments, or only middling ones.

The engrossing scheme carried on by the Executor and Servant of the Testator, might rather be called a posthumous state of infringement upon the Statutes of *Præmunire*, by the power of Property being allowed to continue to be in a *Proprietor* against whom

no

at the time of the decease of the last Liver of all those Persons, that other Person who is to take the property happens to be a Minor, even just born, the twenty-one years of the Minority are to be added to the duration of the *Executorship* prescribed by the Testator, instead of a *Guardian* being appointed both to the person and to the property of such Minor; which lengthening of the duration is intended as a kind of *douceur* in favour of the practice of *Executorships*.—It has been observed, in page 10, that an Executor may continue his Executorship by Assigns, named by him in his own last Will. (See also the Note in page 12).

It may be asked, what is the reason for which the duration of an Executorship, or continuation of an *unmodifiable* engrossing management of devised property, is thus confined to one century, or thereabouts, instead of being allowed to continue for a longer time, or even to be perpetual? I never was able to understand the reason that is given for such limitation. It seemed to me that the reason is merely because, though those Persons who had originally settled such limitation, could swallow one pound of absurd illegality, they could not swallow two pounds.

no Judgment can be given. The same engrossing scheme also is a posthumous state of breach of the peace against the bulk of Mankind, by being an assumption of authority over them, and a power of resolutely dismissing their claims, complaints and objections of any kind, by means of the Executor's bold allegation of the superior duty he owes to his *Employer* the Testator, with whom, he resolutely says, he never can possibly consult, and never can obtain his approbation for the discharging of any claim, or attending to any objection; which alledged duty has been strengthened and *affirmed* by Courts of Law.

To which add, that, when the advantages which are intended to be derived from this posthumous complicate state of illegality, appear too intolerable, and cautious forbearance becomes requisite, the expedient is used, of flinching and skulking from such advantages by means of skulking commissions of still greater illegalities; that is to say, by skulking offences against *Magna Charta*, and also against the Laws directly relative to embezzlement, and by trepanning other Individuals, when obstinate and unsubmitive, into accessions to such offences, for the sake of obtaining redress by such means.

And for what useful purpose is that *posthumous* complicate state of offence against the Statutes of *Præmunire*, and against the peace of Mankind, as well as those skulking commissions of still greater illegalities by which such *posthumous* illegal state continues to be excused? The whole is for the purpose that posthumous avarice, or posthumous vanity, if the Reader prefers calling it so, may be gratified; and that too, with such an extent of engrossment as other Individuals can never finally effect by any legal trade or other pursuit; that is to say, other Individuals unassisted by any law fiction and management, and left, with their own individual weakness, and own individual unassisted flippancy, to encounter either the real opposition, or the contempt, reproaches, and resentment of other Men.— And the effected engrossment may even perhaps consist of scores of millions, of Manors, of Freeholds, and the political rights of whole Counties. (*See back, pages 25, 26, 31*).

It must therefore be admitted, that certain Gentlemen of the Law shew a deal of indulgence, when they bestow no worse a name than the name of *avarice* on the engrossing schemes above-mentioned. They likewise shew their indulgence when they content themselves

themselves with blaming the same engrossing schemes, by merely observing that they have a tendency to accumulation. I shall, by the bye, observe, that there is no great harm yet in *accumulation* merely: designs of accumulation are, we see, the general aim of Trade and Business amongst Men: there is, as just said, no great harm in that; but the great point to be strictly attended to and observed, is, that *accumulation* be performed *with legality*. Accumulation, *without legality*, is very bad, most certainly.

The same Gentlemen also manifest their very great indulgence and tenderness, when they go on merely observing and lamenting that engrossing schemes pursued under cover of Executory Devises, have the effect of preventing Property from being *enjoyed*. But neither is there any great harm yet in forbearance from enjoyment, provided there is no forbearance *from legality*: nothing is yet very much amiss, if, while forbearance from enjoyment continues to be practised, care is taken that *duties* should continue to be performed to other Men, and to Law, and to Legality.

In short, mere accumulation, and mere forbearance from enjoyment, are tolerably harmless things: but they are bad, very bad indeed, when they are united with that state of complicate, high, excessive illegality above described.

Since such complicate high illegality attends the practice of *Executory Devises*, it follows that no expedient of shortening the time of its duration can be called an *amendment*, and that the practice cannot, in fact, be otherwise amended than by being set aside.

The case is different in regard to administrations of the properties of Minors by *Guardians* to the Persons. That degree of irregularity which exists in such a mode of administering Property, may be considerably amended. (*See back, from page 19 to 24*). And such share of irregularity as may be thought fit to continued, may be indulged and excused, for the reasons mentioned in the same pages; because there is no serious illegality *necessarily* inherent in that mode of administering Property, by *mere* Guardians to the Persons and the Properties together.

THE END.



